UNITY

VOLUME CXLII MARCH-APRIL, 1956 No. 1

EDITORIAL

Among the problems to be faced at the May Meetings are the legal limitations on what the American Unitarian Association and the Universalist Church of America, as separate corporations, can do to help finance a third corporation; the reality of denominational loyalties and jealousies; the disproportion of funds and membership as between the two denominations; the fact that the Departments of the Ministry and of Church Extension, two of the most important divisions of both denominations, are not presently included in the Federation; the terrific difficulty of combining the Departments of Publication when the American Unitarian Association's publication interests constitute an operation involving finances larger than the combined budgets of both denominations, exclusive of Publications, and the fact that the Universalist Church of America has no control over publication of the Universalist Leader; the matter of complicated plebiscites proposed by the Interim Commission; and, finally, the swing in opinion in both denominations, especially the Unitarian, against further efforts at either Federation or merger. None of these problems are insoluble, but they are difficult. To me, the least important issue is that of the disproportionate Funds of the two denominations. When two people want to marry, the least of their worries is whether the bride or the groom has more money. This also holds, or should hold, regarding Publications. The fact that the American Unitarian Association's publication interests involve some $350,000 annually, while the Universalist Church of America's publication operations involve less than $5,000, should not be an important consideration with either denomination. The significant fact is that the two denominations have a comparable history and a comparable modern outlook. Nothing should happen in the forthcoming American Unitarian Association Meetings in Boston that could be interpreted as casting doubts on the worthwhileness of our Universalist cousins. Nor should delaying tactics be allowed to win out. Union of these two denominations has been under discussion for more than fifty years. We should either merge or stop talking about it. The time to decide for or against merger is now or in the immediate future, not twenty-five years from now. There has been within the last fifteen years a marked revival in Unitarian circles. Nothing must be allowed to slow down this revival. I see no reason why merger should slow it down; but indecision certainly will. All of these and other related matters should be thoroughly discussed in both denominations. Let decisions be made in the light of full discussion, but made promptly.

Curtis W. Reese.

Cole vs. Shute

DAVID H. COLE

The January-February issue of UNITY carries an article by J. R. Shute, entitled "Should We Merge?" which contains some misleading ideas that call for correction. Mr. Shute speaks of Universalism with an air of authority but with little knowledge. His misinformation, spread upon the pages of UNITY, does a disservice to an organization which claims to seek the truth.

He begins by stating that merger between the Universalist Church of America and the American Unitarian Association is contemplated on the basis of economy. This has never entered any of the reports that I can recall. It seemed to me that merger was contemplated because it was felt that the money now spent for two denominations could be pooled and put into wider use. Mr. Shute seems to feel that the only splinter group that has any validity is Unitarianism, which arose as a novel concept of God, Man, and the Universe and their relationship. Mr. Shute should be aware that Universalism arose as a novel concept of God, Man, and the Universe and their relationship in organized form earlier than did the American Unitarian Association, and it had crystalized into a Unitarian theology before Channing went to Baltimore. No modern Universalist could conceivably accept either supernaturalism or polytheism. Naturalistic theology, whether of the humanistic or theistic brand, has characterised most Universalism for a long period of time. It is the utmost folly to equate John Murray with modern Universalism, as it is to equate William Ellery Channing with modern Unitarianism, and if Mr. Shute had any real acquaintance with the Universalist Church he would not fall into such an obvious trap. A recent meeting of the Midwest Universalist Ministers produced a far more radical statement of faith than I have ever seen come out of Unitarianism.

Mr. Shute goes on to say that the rise of Humanism has brought a new dynamic to Unitarianism. This writer served eight years in Unitarian churches in New England and only heard Humanism spoken of in a derogatory fashion by most Unitarians. There was growth occurring in those Unitarian churches, but it was hardly Humanism that was responsible. At the same time, a large percentage of Universalist ministers in the area were thoroughly humanized and far more progressive than their Unitarian counterparts (which is one of the reasons the writer decided to serve the Universalist church).

Mr. Shute also says that the Universalist Church is decaying and that merger is imperative if they are to survive. Such a statement can only be made out of ignorance. There is more growth and activity in the Universalist church today than in the last one hundred years. Unified appeals contributions are up, the Service Committee has a larger program, new buildings are being built, fellowships are being formed, and new churches are being organized. It is impossible to understand how such a warped notion could get into print in a respectable journal.

Mr. Shute says, too, that Unitarians are exclusive in their relativism, naturalism, acceptance of new truth, scientific support of procedure, freedom of belief, and insistence on the democratic process in human affairs. If he would read the Universalist avowal of 1935 he would find most of those ideas incorporated, and he should know that this avowal was written long before the A.U.A. started its program of advance and came up with its five principles. Present-day Universalism is equally distinguished by what the article says is exclusive to Unitarians.

Universalism goes beyond Unitarianism in several important respects, and if a merger should occur, Universalists can add many things to Unitarianism which will make the larger organization a more vital movement and together we can produce a fuller and deeper expression of liberal religion than either organization has achieved separately. Universalists have concentrated historically on the development of a religious spirit in personality and this emotional emphasis has been lacking historically in Unitarianism. Further, Universalists, in following the genius of their name, have been moving forward toward a world religion outlook and have in their historic philosophy the key to a vital world religion of the future. While Unitarians have been toying with this idea somewhat of late, it is becoming a reality in Universalism in a much more mature and rapid fashion.

I could not disagree with Mr. Shute more fully in the bulk of his article and I trust these remarks can find expression in UNITY, that a more balanced picture of Universalism may be presented. Merger must be considered in the light of the facts as they are, rather than as one misleading article has presented them.

* * * *

In Reply to Mr. David H. Cole

Perhaps I was too crass in describing my opinions of Universalism, but I did so with neither authority nor in total ignorance. If Mr. Cole will refer to his church's Jan. 1st, 1956 statistics (circulated by the Joint Interim Commission) he will note a total of 41,229 adult individual Universalist church members (the 44 Uni-Uni churches last year reported a total gross membership of 11,149); total Universalist fellowships number only 5 (as of the 26th of February there were 181 Unitarian fellowships and several have affiliated since). From these statistics I would hardly employ the term *dynamic* to present-day Universalism.

I did not use the term "exclusive" in my paper as one would infer from reading Mr. Cole's letter.

To his remarks about our New England churches, I feel very much the same way as does Mr. Cole, although I do take some hope and comfort from the fact that a majority of Unitarians in this country today live outside of New England, so they are no longer to be considered typical.

My remarks relative to tritheism and supernaturalism resulted from an experience I had with my Universalist counterpart when I was president of the Unitarian Laymen's League. We dined together and discussed the possibilities of a joint commission to explore the idea of a Liberal Laymen's League to serve both denominations. He said to me that his members considered us rather radical and that many of his members were both supernaturalists and trinitarians. So, this opinion was not entirely my own.

I must confess a lack of enthusiasm for the philosophy of bigness, and I can see little opportunity for advancing liberalism, as I believe Mr. Cole and I both understand the term, in this proposed merger. I have yet to see many advantages which conceivably might result from it and, at the same time, I can see many disadvantages which possibly could result. The idea of a council composed of liberal churches throughout this country has an entirely different connotation to me and others.

J. Ray Shute.

Universalist-Unitarian Merger: Will We Face the Facts?

ROBERT M. BOWMAN

A very wise person once said of an actor whose popularity was on the wane: "The trouble with John is that he believes his own press agent." This can be just as true of an organization as it is of an individual. One of the greatest handicaps facing those who are charged with developing ways and means of exploring the road to Uni-Uni merger is the fact that Unitarians and Universalists persist in the game of comparing propaganda, rather than in pursuing the actual likenesses and differences of their two groups.

While Mr. Shute's recent article in Unity (Jan.-Feb. 1956) contains several valid insights that demand our attention, there is much in it that demands rebuttal or clarification. Like many other discerning persons who are concerned over the merger issue, he has not been able to draw a line to distinguish where Unitarian promotional literature leaves off and reality begins. Whether we be for or against the merger, ultimately, it is necessary that we stop listening to our "press agent" long enough to examine the facts. Let us attempt to do this by examining some of Mr. Shute's remarks.

In discussing the origins of the two denominations in America, he implies that while Unitarianism was a truly radical movement religiously, Universalism was no more than a pietistic concern for "Universal Salvation." It may seem thus to a modern Unitarian, but any careful examination of the early history of both groups will reveal how overly simplified this view is. In the beginning both groups were radical departures from the orthodox norm. Of the two, the Universalist platform actually seems to have been the more radical. It is significant that while Hosea Ballou, a leading Universalist, could accept and teach Dr. Channing's "brand" of Unitarianism, i.e., the Unity of God, Dr. Channing and most Unitarians could not accept the doctrine of "No Hell." Even a casual reading of Channing reveals Biblicalism nearly as determined as that found among Universalists of the period. In proof of this complexity of viewpoint, let me indicate two matters of record:

1. When the "Restorationist Controversy" arose among Universalists over the issue of a "Limited Hell" or "No Hell," many of those Universalist ministers who argued for the need of some future punishment found welcome haven within the *Unitarian* fold.

2. Likewise the majority Unitarian reaction to the progressive religious and social philosophy of Theodore Parker was to strike his name from the Unitarian Yearbook for most of his professional life.

The point of this is not to propagandize. It is not to identify one side as progressive and the other as conservative. This simply cannot be done. These episodes are cited simply to induce a little humility in both denominations when speaking of "Our Heritage." The truth is that by the standards of modern scientific thinking, *neither* the Universalism nor the Unitarianism of the early nineteenth century appears particularly enticing. We have to accept the fact that what each denomination proposed was radical for its day. We should cherish both efforts as the first vague struggles toward the progressive position that we espouse today. But actually these humble beginnings do not have much practical bearing upon the problem of merger that now faces us.

To look further at the histories of these two movements will only reveal the slowness with which each approached the present "liberal" position. The most damning statement that can be made about Universalism during the nineteenth century is Eddy's in his *History of Universalism,* published in 1882: "German Rationalism . . . sought a foothold in the Universalist church and . . . fascinated some of the younger preachers . . . The seal of denominational disapprobation was put upon all [such] attempts . . ." Yet before we hasten to draw too much from this, we should read Dr. Charles Lyttle's history of the Western Unitarian Conference and meditate upon the almost soul-destroying handicaps that the Unitarian denomination put upon Jenkin Lloyd Jones and the "Unity Men"—the forbears of modern religious Humanism. That the Universalist Rationalists lost for a season, while the "Unity Men" won, is more the result of differences in denominational polity than it is a question of strength. Both groups—Universalist Rationalists and Unitarian "Unity Men"—were minorities within their historic churches.

In all fairness it must be admitted that the above events are the source of an embarrassing contrast between part of Universalism and part of Unitarianism in the Midwest today. Yet that contrast has been on the decline and the next ten years should see the elimination of the disparity. That is, it will disappear if the Unitarians do not, through a perverse form of intellectual snobbery, drive the Universalists into retreat out of a need to find self-respect.

Historically, the real difference between our two denominations has been social. Unitarianism arose as a movement among the elite of New England, while Universalism was essentially a middle-class and lower middle-class movement. Unitarianism was essentially urban: Universalism in its heydey boasted a large rural constituency. These factors have conferred upon both churches a goodly measure of advantage and disadvantage. They have dictated the relative speeds at which each group has advanced and how they have advanced. It would seem that in this present age, class and place of origin should play a continuingly diminishing role in separating the two denominations. If this is not true, then we are just amusing ourselves

with talk of the "democratic process."

Mr. Shute also notes that a generation ago both Universalism and Unitarianism were dead. With this there is little argument. As to why they were dead is not hard to discover. One has only to read the results of the "theological opinion poll" which the late George Herbert Betts conducted among theological school students in 1929 to realize that Unitarian and Universalist viewpoints were fast flavoring the major denominations who proceeded to drive the Uni-Unis out of business with their own merchandise. I, myself, became a liberal under the influence of the late Dean Shirley Jackson Case, who was nominally a Baptist, but who was more truly Unitarian than many of my brethren who claim that label.

That Unitarianism experienced a renaissance after the war is a happy result of circumstances. Mr. Shute gives the credit to a "sense of mission" and to "Humanism." With this there is no argument. Yet major credit must be shared with the new conservatism that began to beguile the major denominations after the war. If there had not been a resurgence of orthodoxy, there probably would have been no corresponding "Unitarian Advance." We can thank our neo-orthodox brethren for supplying us, all unwittingly, with a mission.

Mr. Shute says that in the meanwhile Universalism has continued to "decay." One might question whether or not "decay" adequately describes the situation. A better word to describe the Universalist position might be "frustration." Universalism has always been long on hope and short on cash. This coupled with the fact that it has been put into the demeaning position of saying "Me Too" to the position of Unitarianism has made its task a hard one. To this I can personally testify. Its misfortune has been that it was not in a position to say as quickly or as widely what the Unitarian denomination was saying. Obviously, a consummated merger will remedy this psychological defect. In this respect Mr. Shute is right in saying that merger is desirable. This is even more desirable than the financial "boost" to which he quite properly alludes.

Mr. Shute says of certain items of Universalist religion—"Universal brotherhood, Racial integration, Social action and Peace"—that they are not distinctively liberal. But whether they are liberal or not actually depends upon two things: (1) Whether they are actually practiced, and (2) what serves as the intellectual and emotional motivation for the position. If they are motivated by the "scientific spirit," "acceptance of new truth," "belief in the democratic process," (these are Mr. Shute's words describing the genius of modern Unitarianism) then they are distinctively liberal. It is not just what we believe or do not believe that distinguishes our liberal churches from other churches, it is what we do and why we do it that makes us unique. On this level I firmly believe that Universalists and Unitarians are blood brothers.

At this time it would not be amiss to confess that the Universalist clergy have been disturbed over this question of whether modern Universalism has a message that is uniquely and vitally its own. The result has been the setting up of a series of seminars by the Universalist Ministers Association for the purpose of examining the deeper implications of the Universalist position. Already some exciting and stimulating answers are beginning to appear. These the Universalists will gladly share with their Unitarian brethren, provided they are not too abruptly dismissed as prehistoric "No Hellers."

Mr. Shute is certainly correct when he suggests that we must go into the process of exploring merger with our eyes open. But as one who is both a Unitarian minister and a Universalist minister—with no qualm of conscience—I feel that he has been loading the dice just a bit.

Both churches have grown out of historic movements. Each movement has had its bright moments; each its moments of darkness. There is no profit to the present in fighting old battles. That is for "old codgers" sitting in a country store. Both churches must come to the "conference" table with a reasonable pride and assurance born of the past. But each must also come with a willingness to confess his own clay feet. Then it must be determined whether or not both parties are mature enough to live together, or whether they are petulant children. There they must decide whether their destinies flow together or apart.

In any event we must not be taken in by our own press agents.

The Growth of Liberal Religion in Greater Chicago*

HOMER A. JACK

These are great days for religious liberalism. These are great days—denominationally—to be alive. For every one religious liberal we lose by denominational hyphenization—I prefer to use a comma, rather than a hyphen and thus I suppose the term ought to be denominational coma—for every one we lose, we probably gain three or four.

In 1938-39—a year when church statistics are still fairly available—there were 13 liberal churches in the greater Chicago area: 9 Unitarian and 4 Universalist. Excluding for the moment Peoples Church of Chicago —which was then and is today a Unitarian Church, but if we include its uniformly high figures the results of any statistical comparison tend to make us much too complacent—there were, in these 12 churches, a total of 1,469 members in 1938-39. This is an average membership of 122 persons per church. In the same year, 1938-39, a total of 115 persons joined 9 of these churches, for an average of 13 new members per church. The church schools had a combined total enrollment of 412 children, or 51 pupils per church having a church school. The combined annual budgets of 10 of these churches was $51,416, or $5,100 per church. For these 10 churches, that averaged an annual contribution of $46 per church member in 1938-39.

Now if we add Peoples Church to these 1938-39 figures, there was a total of 4,538 religious liberals in greater Chicago during that period—instead of 1,469—and the number of children in church schools rose to 612. And the total spent by all the churches rose

*Delivered at the second All-Chicago Unitarian-Universalist dinner on January 20, 1956.

to $95,435.

In fifteen years—1939-1955—what has happened? One church, the Brotherhood, has dissolved. Another church, Peoples Liberal in Englewood, which became Unitarian in 1939, merged with the new Beverly church in 1952. In this same 15-year period, not only Beverly (1942) but other new Unitarian churches and fellowships were established as follows: All Souls Unitarian (formerly Free Religious Fellowship) in 1950, Highland Park Fellowship in 1953, Park Forest Fellowship in 1952 (becoming a church in 1955), and DuPage Valley Fellowship in 1955. Thus, today, there are 17 Unitarian and Universalist churches and fellowships in greater Chicago: 13 Unitarian and 4 Universalist—not including Michigan City or Racine.

Today—or more accurately, using 1954-55 statistics—the total Unitarian-Universalist membership, again excluding Peoples Church, in greater Chicago is 2,879 adults in these 16 churches. This is an average of 180 persons per church. This is just about a hundred per cent gain in the total number of religious liberals in the past fifteen years in this area. Each church now has an average membership of 180 persons, a gain of 58 persons or about 50 per cent gain in membership. The total number of new members coming into our Chicago area churches in the past year was 528 or 33 per church. This is a gain of about 350 per cent in new members each year.

The total number of children enrolled in our church schools has jumped from 412 to 1,362. Now there are 97 children per church school, rather than 51. The increase is more than 200 per cent for the total number of children now going to all of our schools combined, and the increase is almost 100 per cent in the number attending, on the average, each of our church schools. The total amount spent annually by 15 of the 17 churches is $190,650, or an increase of about 300 per cent, with the average church budget jumping from $5,100 to $12,710. However for 15 churches, the average contribution per church member was $67., only a 45 per cent increase which is probably no more than the increase in cost of living due to inflation since 1938.

Now if we add Peoples Church again to these 1954-55 figures, there is a total of 7,000 members today—instead of 2,879—and the total spent is $271,174. And these figures do not include substantial capital funds canvasses recently concluded in such churches as First Universalist, Third Unitarian, Geneva Unitarian, Hobart Unitarian, and Evanston.

When we look at our combined statistics—17 liberal churches encompassing seven thousand persons, almost 1,500 Sunday School students and almost $300,000 in combined budgets—we can be both proud and uncomfortable. We can be proud that, with so few, we have been able to do so much. There is still only about one Unitarian-Universalist per thousand in greater Chicago. Despite our severe minority status, we can get much more than our share of the news and, more important, we can make more than our share of a social and religious impact on our greater Chicago community.

We can be proud, but we should be uncomfortable, too—and the contemporary posture of a religious person, even of a religious liberal, should be more of pain than of pride. We Unitarians and Universalists are not substantially changing the lives of our own members—or of our community, metropolitan area, nation, or world. I suppose I should speak for myself; at least I am not making this impact; maybe you are. We have neither the incisive fire of a sect nor the broad impact of a denomination. We cannot have it both ways, but some of us feel that the first priority is almost to double our numbers and approach denominational size, and so some of us are moving Universalist heaven and Unitarian earth to bring off our belated marriage.

First the bride was reluctant, but now it appears that the groom has cold feet. Somehow we must bring bride and groom to the altar—permissively but promptly—and the marriage must be permanent and not just a trial affair, not a kind of legalized, denominational free love. This marriage is our number one target for the next few months ahead. As chairman of the Midwest Chapter of the Unitarian Ministers Association, I think I can speak for the overwhelming number of Unitarian ministers in the Midwest—in saying that we are inspired by the complete Unitarian-Universalist cooperation amongst both ministers and laymen in greater Chicago. And thus we ministers will do everything humanly—and professionally—possible to bring this denominational marriage about, and promptly.

Modern Religion

M. ALVA ZOOK

The Humanist Liberal Church offers a fellowship of brave people who believe this life here and now can be made a joyful adventure. The people have faith in the leadership of forward-looking intelligent men and women of today. The people reject the Nicene Creed of 325 AD. They have the wisdom to see and the courage to acknowledge benightedness of the past. They believe we live in a moving changing world. The Humanist Church presents beliefs, objects of devotion, human values, and faith worthy of intelligent people living in this age of science and abundance.

From man's knowledge of the world about him and from conditioning by parents and ecclesiastics come man's beliefs about man and the universe. From these beliefs come his objects of devotion, his hierarchy of values, and his faith. Beliefs, objectives, values, faith, these four constitute his religion. All of these differ between Humanists, Liberals, Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Christians, Mohammedans, Hindus, Buddhists.

Primitive man struggled to survive, facing complex nature with scant knowledge and much fear of the unknown. Among his fellow men arose the shaman who claimed to be able to help his fellow men deal with the unknown. For this help the shaman collected tribute and exercised considerable social control. The shaman later developed into the priestcraft, and the priestcraft came to be of the dominant minority of society that set the culture pattern, they came to be a major arm of government with prior power for exploitation and social control of the many. For more effective social control, and to more effectively command the obedience of the many, they invented supernaturalism, they invented original sin, God in Heaven for reward for obedience, the Devil in Hell for punishment for disobedience.

They invented pageantry for front for themselves. They invented ritual, worship, prayer, supplication, obeisances, to appease their God, and to instill fear, awe, respect, obedience, servility, immaturity, into the many. They encouraged putting up with misery. They continually preached of the depravity of man, of the great reward of Heaven, of the terrible punishment of Hell, of disdain for this life, of obedience to their commands. They were self-appointed temporal agents of the God they had invented. Their God always spoke for the generous economic support, the prestige, and the power of his agents. The priestcraft conditioned the many to beliefs, objects of devotion, values, and faith that served their prestige, power, and exploitive privileges. They conditioned them to beliefs in miracles to discredit the facts of observation. They conditioned them to faith in their authority. They effectively conditioned the many to accept their culture pattern and their authority.

The minds of primitive men were wholly occupied with getting the next meal, getting clothing and shelter, and caring for the women and children. There was not time to speculate on the ways of the universe, nor intelligence enough. But what was done of this nature was done by the shaman or the priestcraft, and their findings and inventions were conditioned into the minds of the many. When knowledge and intelligence got a little further along, a very few men with superior intelligence and time to speculate, and not concerned with social control or exploitation, did speculate on the ways of the universe and life, and such men came up with Omar Khayyam ideas, not with supernaturalism, sin, God, and the Devil.

Now, in this year 1956, in the culture pattern of metropolitan USA, with basic needs supplied in abundance, security fairly secure, some leisure time available, some choice of what to do, we become interested in what best to do with life. We seek some beliefs that are believable, some worthwhile objects of devotion, some worthy values, some dependable faith. The beliefs, objects of devotion, values, faith which the priestcraft gave us, beliefs in miracles, Heaven in the next world, doubtful happiness here and now, faith in their authority, these we reject. Now we must find new beliefs, new objects of devotion, new human values, new faith.

It is said frequently that liberals have no beliefs, no faith. This is a mistake, I think. The beliefs and faith of liberals are like truth, not fixed. Liberals have advancing beliefs, and an advancing faith. Automobile design is advancing, but the design of any one model of car is fixed for the period of its use, though many improvements are found before it is worn out, yet the owner uses the car as is till it is worn out. A new car model again fixes the design for the period of its use.

So, I think beliefs, objects of devotion, human values, and faith need to be clearly formulated, recognized, and accepted as valid and usable till the next improvement.

The following metaphysical concepts, beliefs, are accepted, I believe, by our leading philosophers as sufficiently valid to guide our conduct at this time, and until new discoveries are made to change these beliefs. As these beliefs change with new discoveries, we change our objects of devotion, our values, our faith. New discoveries cause minor changes to occur perhaps several times a year. Major changes occur only over a period of some years. It is one of the functions of the Humanist Church to inform its people of new discoveries and appraise and evaluate them, and point out the needed changes in our conduct. These metaphysical concepts are rational facts discovered by intellectual men of recent times. The implications of these concepts are far reaching, and are in sharp contradiction to the invented fictional concepts of the priestcraft, inventions for the purpose of exploitation and social control.

Truth is what we believe to be true. But truth is not fixed. Truth is only the best we believe today. Tomorrow it may be invalidated and replaced by a wholly different truth, or it may be refined. Forty some years ago a solidly accepted truth was that matter is indestructible; today an equally solidly accepted truth is that matter is destructible, a 100 per cent reversal. The ratio of the diameter to the circumference of a circle was three and one-seventh, then 3.1416, then 3.1415926536, and now much more refined by our complex computing machines. Thus truth is refined. However, the older superseded truths and unrefined truths yet have the same usefulness they had originally. The difference is in the limits of application.

The phenomena of nature are constant and wholly dependable as such. Order and form in the universe are the result of material blind obedience to natural laws. There exists in nature no purposeful supreme intelligence. These are proven many times over by our daily observation, reason, and intelligence. The implication of this is that supernaturalism is a wholly false, dangerous, and poisonous concept. It was invented by a priestcraft for purposes of exploitation and social control. Faith in the supernatural kills a man's courage, kills his responsibility, kills his dignity. The supernatural is inscrutable and unconquerable, no use trying. Lacking courage, men avoid innovation, they despise knowledge, they avoid facts that present difficulties, they resort to wishful thinking and thereby invite grief, pain, disaster in the here and now. They spend their efforts in futile ritual and prayer hoping to appease the Almighty. Supernaturalism kills confident dependence on cause and effect in nature, it encourages mysticism. Supernaturalism makes of the individual a cringing coward before an all-powerful tyrant in the sky, and an obsequious yes person before men of power here on earth. Faith in supernaturalism retards and prevents maturity in the individual. It postulates determinism, a determinism of the most vicious kind, an all-powerful tyrant in the sky who demands a master and slave relationship. It causes arrested development. It fosters dependence, submission, conformity, frustration, neurosis. This is what the men of power of the Middle Ages wanted in the illiterate population under their dominance. And this is what some men of power in our own country want today. The creed of the Council of Nicaea was formulated with such in view. Men of the Council appealing to decency and reason were thrown out as heretics. Knowledege of nature was discredited. The creed had no relation whatever to observable facts, even of that time. The desires of the supernatural always were such as would support the prestige and power of the priestcraft. The priestcraft were self-appointed temporal agents of the tyrant in the sky, thus empowered to enforce tyranny in the here and now.

Infinite space, infinite time. These concepts are based on our astronomical observations and imply no beginning and no ending for space and time. Spontaneous creation out of nothing is not valid in logic or in observation.

Matter, energy, motion. These concepts are everyday

observation all about us. In our physical and chemical laboratories they are subject to mathematical computation.

Events, change, contingency, relativity, evolution. These concepts recognize a moving and not a static universe. Contingency is the pervasive and continual meetings or intersections of independent causal sequences, both in non-human nature and in human affairs. Contingency accounts for the frequent emergence of novelty. Relativity recognizes one moving object in relation to another object, it is subject to mathematical computation. Evolution is our recognition of development sequence. Biological evolution and stellar evolution are observable phenomena. Biological evolution is important in that it shows us man's place in nature and his relation to his environment, his possible and probable progress or development. It discredits most priestcraft hypotheses about man, such as sin, guilt, life after death, Adam the first man.

Ideas are concepts of nature's forces, forms, orders, processes, and other phenomena. A table is an idea, a circle is an idea, $x^2 + y^2 = r^2$ is the same idea expressed in terms of rectangular coordinates, the center of the circle at the origin. Einstein's equation $E = mc^2$ is an exceedingly powerful idea, it is an equation of the atomic bomb. Ideas are very useful and very powerful concepts, useful for the purposes of prediction and control of nature. Ideas seem unsubstantial, yet they are very real. Ideas always require material for formulation, the material of a biological brain mechanism, the material of a computing machine, the material of wood for a table, the material of ink and paper for a mathematical equation. Ideas do not have existence in a vacuum. Forms like a table, machines like an automobile, mathematical equations, are combinations of ideas put together by a biological brain mechanism or a computing machine. They help the organism which uses them to survive. The priestcraft shroud ideas with mystery, they impose them on that super mind in the sky, off somewhere out of range of our telescopes, countless millions distant, in a mythical vacuum. Onto some hazy ideas they tag that obfuscating word spiritual.

Life in a multitude of forms is an observable phenomenon. Life is recognized as a property of matter, a property of the matter protoplasm. It is a property of matter somewhat similar to chemical affinity. Life is an organizing process, organizing for the purpose of form perpetuation, continuance. A stomach is a mechanical organ organized to convert food into body energy. A lung is a mechanical organ organized to use oxygen to clear blood. A brain is a mechanical organ organized to store, sort, and combine ideas, similar to an adding machine, a slide rule, or a highly complex computing machine. A brain like a stomach or lung serves the organism by helping survival. This observation discredits the priestcraft hypothesis of a supreme mind in the sky with a cosmic purpose. Purpose exists only in a biological organism with a brain, striving to survive. Purpose exists nowhere else in the universe, so far as our observation or reason can detect.

Man is a free agent. By the use of his knowledge, observation, reason, and intelligence he is able to create wholly new forms and orders. Man is master of his destiny, and alone responsible for his individual well-being, and for the well-being of the social order. Having faith in his knowledge, observation, reason, intelligence, and creative originality man has raised his culture pattern from that of the cave man to the culture pattern of today that can look at television. This concept of man is based on reason and observable facts. It encourages his efforts, grants him freedom, supports his dignity, promotes his happiness, fosters faith in himself, and demands responsibility from him. This concept of man, endowing him with original creative power, endowing him with power to create innovation, extends to man much power. It places his future open and conquerable. This concept fosters expectation for advancement, it fosters confidence for super achievement, to the possibility of extensive travel in space, and the possibility, when more of the riddle of life is learned, of limitless life for the individual. The supernatural concept of the priestcraft makes of man only a pawn in the hands of a tyrannical deity.

Moral conduct is that course of conduct which experience has taught men is necessary to enable men to live together and allow all members of society a maximum of freedom for individual development. It is embodied in our customs, mores, morals, ethics, and codified laws. Morals change with a changing technology and a changing culture pattern. Morals-ethics are a question of "What are the rules, when and where." Nature is amoral, neither merciful nor cruel. Justice is that course of conduct which gives effective assistance to group survival and fosters individual development to maximum. The moral codes formulated by the priestcraft are such as give them economic support, exploitation privileges, prestige, and power. They include only some and not all of the most obvious good moral conduct, and they include much immorality, frustration, and grief for mankind. An important point in the separation of Church and State is that our moral conduct shall be based on social experience, and shall not be based on priestcraft moral codes designed for exploitation and social control. Man is not punished in a future life for his sins, man is punished in the here and now by his sins. And the greatest sins are ignorance, wishful thinking, and social disloyalty.

Our future life is in our children, and in those elements of our culture pattern to which individually we have added original created innovations. Researches in biology and psychology give us convincing evidence that for the individual, this life is all and enough. But if there is any future life, it will come to us as a law of nature, like our coming here, and the more advanced we are here, the better we will be there. This flatly contradicts the promises of the priestcraft. The future life here presented is wholly genuine, wholly believable, and it fosters happiness and well-being here and now.

Our survival depends upon our ability to change, and on our intellectual ability to guide our change in a direction favorable to survival. Knowledge of nature, observation, reason, and intelligence are our guide. Knowledge, sound judgment, eternal vigilance are the price of survival. From the nature of man and the universe, it follows that each individual himself must choose his beliefs, his specific objects of devotion, his hierarchy of values, his faith, and himself test in practice their desirability. There is no certainty in our life, progress is not inevitable, it must be fought for and won. Often we guess wrong, but on the average we improve.

Man's destiny is made by man's instinctive proclivities. The urge of life within man is to do these three things: survive and bring to maturity creditable progeny, develop individual potentialities to maximum, and exercise creative originality and thereby add constructively to the culture pattern. Survive, develop,

create, these are the basic drives, these are the commands of nature to man. This is what to do with life. To these objectives we devote our efforts, these are our objects of devotion. Specific objects of devotion must be chosen by the individual. Usually they are based on talent and opportunity. For an individual, major efforts and objects of devotion might be: personal survival and creditable support and care for spouse and children; to study and develop talent in a chosen line in which some talent already is present, and to create and invent improvements to be added to our culture pattern.

A hierarchy of human values must be chosen by the individual. Values and their hierarchical order change with an advancing changing technology, they change with time and locality, and they differ in different culture patterns. Some important values are: good health, a critical open mind, courage, integrity and equity, creative vocation, scientific method, science, broad comprehensive knowledge of nature and mankind, intellectual and economic freedom, democracy, material well-being.

Broad comprehensive knowledge of nature and mankind is a most important value. This consists of a general knowledge of all of the hierarchy of the sciences. These consist of Language, Semantics, Mathematics, Astronomy, Geology, Paleontology, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Psychology, Social Psychology, Cultural Anthropology, Sociology, Philosophy. It is the power of this knowledge that gives to us our ability to predict and control nature, and shape our environment to our needs and wants. It gives to us our abundance, our ease, peace, comforts, and our security. It is only this knowledge which primitive man lacked that made his life so precarious. Today masses of people lacking it make for much insecurity in the world. Lacking this knowledge men become the victims of deception. They are deceived by salesmen of goods and services, they are misled by politicians, they are misled by ecclesiastics. A shelf of books, of the most recent books by the most competent scholars in the several disciplines above set forth, is to the Humanist what the Bible is to the Christian, what the Koran is to the Mohammedan.

Faith is willingness to act on inconclusive data. Our faith is in ourselves, individually and collectively. It is rational faith based on man's continued improvement of his life from primitive man to the culture pattern of today. We have faith in knowledge, observation, reason, intelligence, experiment, creative originality, mutual aid, social cooperation, individual judgment. We have faith in the methods of science.

To sum up: A beneficially useful religion with which to be happy in 1956 metropolitan USA is this: Let your moral conduct be guided by the customs, mores, morals, ethics, and codified laws of present time and your immediate locality. Let your conduct be such as you believe will be good for you, and equally good for society. Strive to survive and care for your children. Bringing to maturity your children is life's most rewarding adventure. Develop your potentialities, acquire comprehensive knowledge. Choose your specific life objectives based on your talent and your opportunities. Set up your hierarchy of values. Base your beliefs on observable facts. Put your faith in knowledge, observation, reason, intelligence, creative originality, and the mutual aid and cooperation of your fellow men. Hold to faith in yourself, however often you may miss your guess. Then pursue your objectives. Create original innovations to add to the culture pattern of your day. Creative achievement is one of the great joys of life. Life is not what you get, life is what you do. Happiness is the creative activity and effort of the present moment.

With such a religion you are not conditioned to dependence, obedience, conformity, immaturity. You are not conditioned to fear, obeisances, servility. Your dignity and intelligence are not insulted and deprecated. You are not frustrated by a guilt complex. You are not troubled by neurosis from arrested development. Your courage is not killed by a vicious determinism. Nature to you is not fickle and uncertain. You are not continually confused by double talk. You do not resort to wishful thinking, you do not avoid facts. Guidance of your moral conduct is not based on priestcraft inventions designed for exploitation and social control. You do not waste your time and efforts on futile ritual and prayer. You are not burdened with the economic support of a misleading and exploiting priestcraft.

With such a religion, such objects of devotion, such values, such knowledge and beliefs, such faith in yourself and your fellow men, you come to maturity. You have the supreme joy of the love and affection of your children, you have the joy of creative achievement, you expect, welcome, and enjoy innovation and novelty. You face life with confidence, with high courage to challenge all nature, you face the world with joyful hope toward victorious conquest. You carry yourself with dignity, with nobility. You carry yourself erect, confident, fearless, with your head up.

The first selection ever issued—

SELECTED LETTERS

OF

JOHN WESLEY

•

Edited and annotated by F. C. Gill

Wesley was one of the most prolific letter-writers of all time, and one of the best; direct, concise, logical, imperious, affectionate, sweetly reasonable or scornful as occasion demanded. This selection gives a wonderful portrait of the writer and a vivid picture of 18th century religious life.

Special Order Coupon

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, Publishers
15 East 40th St., Desk 617, N. Y. 16, N. Y.

Enclosed is $..... for..... copy(ies) of SELECTED LETTERS OF JOHN WESLEY, at $6.00 per copy.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

(Expedite shipment by enclosing remittance)

The Fiction of a Reformed Capitalism

VICTOR S. YARROS

Are Americans particularly naive, credulous, fond of flattery and clever humbug? One foreign-born psychiatrist has written several booklets in recent years to establish the thesis that we Americans are indeed *collectively* "infantile," and that we do and say things that no European of any education or culture could possibly be guilty of, at least under fairly normal circumstances. How much truth is there in this sweeping indictment? And if any truth there be in it, how are we to account for the fact?

A bulky volume would be required for an adequate treatment of these queries, and this task should tempt the younger native sociologists and anthropologists. Here and now I must limit myself to a consideration of some recent books and magazine articles—for some strange reason dismissed by nearly all the reviewers with vague and superficial comments that must have disappointed earnest and thoughtful readers anxious for light on the general problem of collective maturity, self-criticism, and candor.

Of course, pseudo-science and half-baked speculation we have with us always. What is peculiar to contemporary America is what seems to be a definite and deliberate policy of the press and organized business to cultivate fancies and fictions, or make-believe, and to seek to darken counsel and mislead the majority. The knowledge that a rude awakening is in store for the deluded, and that this awakening is certain to beget serious consequences, in politics as well as in economics, is thrust aside. The lessons of painful experience are disregarded by the propagandists of pollyanna optimism.

Several years ago a thoroughly fallacious book was published, and widely read, which proclaimed the glad tidings that America was in the throes of a beneficent and momentous "managerial revolution." Capitalists were deliberately making room in industry and commerce for engineers, experts, natural and trained leaders who subordinated profits and money-making, to efficiency, economy, and community welfare. These men were not "reformers," and disclaimed sentimental altruism or idealism. They were realists, practical rather than theoretical in their thinking. They hated waste, favoritism, nepotism, slackness, indolence, greed, avarice. They knew how to fight and do away with these evils and abuses. They were saving a reclaimed capitalism and thus rendering Socialism and Communism obsolete.

Recently, two books, one by a professor of economics, the other by a magazine editor and liberal, developed and popularized this cheerful point of view.

I am referring to *American Capitalism,* by Professor John K. Galbraith of Harvard, and *The Big Change,* by the late Frederick Lewes Allen. Galbraith is no special pleader, no apologist, for capitalism. He directs our attention, and that of the Marxians and Fabians as well, to the alleged fact that capitalism today is not the capitalism of a century, a half-century, or even a quarter century ago; that it has been forced to mend some of its ways and to abandon the wicked and cruel tactics of the "robber barons," and has accepted government controls and regulations which in the McKinley-Coolidge era were denounced as socialistic, un-American, subversive, intolerable. Moreover, it has had to reckon with "countervailing power"—in the form of federated labor unions, chain stores, mail order firms, cooperatives, and the like.

Competition of the old "classical type has largely disappeared, and monopoly and near-monopoly control much of our economic life, but the newer competition is effectively protecting the consumers both directly and indirectly. Restraints on private power exist despite the admitted weakness of the anti-trust statutes and the erratic conduct of the Federal and State law-enforcing authorities. Bigness has to reckon with big opposition. To quote Galbraith: "It was the power of the steel industry, not the organizing abilities of John L. Lewis and Philip Murray, that brought the United Miners into being." More, and still more, power, then, to the new competitors of the tamed and chastened capitalism.

Mr. Allen is less academic and more journalistic than Galbraith. He writes as an impartial, sober observer of men, things and events. He sympathizes with the moderate critics of capitalism, but he is satisfied that "creeping socialism" is not the solution of the problems engendered by capitalism. We are, he thinks, definitely past Socialism. We no longer depend on it or look forward to it. It has been tried and found inadequate and in part irrelevant. It has disillusioned the worker and the reformer. We now want measures that promote moral and spiritual progress, as well as material. The wage worker needs respect for his person, a sense of belonging to and being appreciated by society. He has more leisure than ever before, but his free hours yield him little satisfaction. He misses the superior pleasures of existence, the enjoyment of the fine arts and of philosophy. The unions do not fully represent him. The governments do not understand him. We must raise his status. We must do our part in enriching his life and in making it more abundant and more truly civilized.

It would be idle to deny that these two books, only roughly summarized, merit earnest study. They contain valuable suggestions, negative and positive. Yet they leave me—and no doubt others—with the feeling that the authors are overstating their cases, indulging in wishful thinking, minimizing difficulties, painting glowing and sensational pictures. This is not the method or spirit of science or scientific philosophy. Their celebrations are decidedly premature.

To begin with, capitalism has not yet succeeded in solving the crucial problem of the boom-bust business cycle. In the midst of artificial, unhealthy, insecure "prosperity," men of affairs notoriously dread the "next depression." Their able experts dare not reassure them, and their somewhat hopeful forecasts are qualified by ifs and buts, thus virtually justifying the apprehensions and precautions of the biggest corporations.

A major depression means, these days, more government in business, not less, more "Socialism"—and not creeping, either—more and more drastic control of credit, investment, and profit rates. *Laissez-faire* is as dead as Haman. Private, free enterprise was killed by the blind, grasping capitalists, whose appetite for monopoly even Adam Smith rebuked and condemned.

Yes, labor now bargains collectively with management and capital, but in too many instances, alas, good faith is lacking, and the hope of nullifying the hated

New Deal is still strong at the top. The return to the Injunction by the Taft-Hartley law was not accidental, and involuntary servitude for eighty days for strikers accused vaguely of jeopardizing national security can be extended at the discretion of a reactionary majority in Congress. The trade and industrial unions are big, and will grow bigger, but their treasuries are not inexhaustible, and protracted litigation is a serious handicap. A strike spells almost immediate need of soup-kitchens, whereas the managers of big industry expect to receive their fat paychecks punctually. Legislation prohibiting industry-wide bargaining, or striking, is known to be favored and contemplated by influential Republicans of the Old Guard.

The right to organize and resort to strikes is by no means firmly established. In the South, labor organizers are apt to be ordered by the Bourbons to "take the next train back home, or else," and the "else" is enforced by gangsters and private spies who have the backing of police chiefs and sheriffs, and who count on the local grand and trial juries to bail them out, together with their employers, often pew-holders in the local churches and pillars of respectable society.

Oh yes, labor *has* made notable gains since 1932, but eternal vigilance is still the price of social justice and equal opportunity. The Roosevelt era actually ended on November 4, 1948. A reactionary coalition in Congress declared a cold war and government by filibuster and defiant obstruction "for the duration." The Eisenhower victory of November 4, 1952, was a spectacular triumph, not an approval of hypocritical politics. You cannot fool all of the people all of the time, but you can fool many millions for the time required by wealthy demagogues or "plutogogues" in presidential and mid-term election years. Revolution by consent is wonderful, to be sure, but counter-revolution by like and apparent consent, engineered and brought about by adroit sophists and tricky ad-men, is always possible and often probable. Contemporary corporate "public relations" are also wonderful, and fearful. Henry R. Luce's *Fortune* and *Life* "sell" them successfully and make money.

In closing, I remind myself that I have said nothing of a third recent book, *The Permanent Revolution,* by a Luce editor. The simple truth is that I cannot take this extravaganza seriously. It is too Pickwickian. The "permanent revolution" is a myth. It is not permanent, and it is not revolutionary. The foregoing comments on Galbraith and Allen amply cover the camouflaged ground it pretends to illuminate.

On Giving Offense

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

We must not expect to profess and proclaim our faith with conviction and power, to stand up bravely for the ideals of a good society, to participate with devotion and enthusiasm in movements for social progress and reform, and to labor earnestly and faithfully for the promotion of world peace, justice, and brotherhood without discovering that by so doing we are giving offense and causing annoyance to many of our fellow-men. Faith offends disbelief; good offends evil; truth offends error; progress offends the status quo, etc., all of which may be summed up in the simple truism that "no matter what you believe, how you think, and what you do, someone will be offended because you differ from what he believes, from how he thinks, and from what he does." This is a truism which we shall disregard at our peril and forget at the risk of much discomfort and disillusionment; and this truism is as significant for individuals as it is for groups, communities, and nations. It has always been true that, where individuals have stood up boldly for the things they held sacred and dear, where groups dared to propagandize their faith or to spread their culture, they were greeted with suspicion, prejudice, intolerance, and even with active hostility by those who felt offended, annoyed, and injured by new voices, by alleged "revelations" of new truths, and by novel methods of propaganda and evangelization.

In the world of international affairs today the voice of democracy deeply offends those who hold that some form of totalitarianism is to be preferred for the government of peoples; and, vice versa, the raucous propaganda of every form of dictatorship profoundly irks and grossly offends those who hold that democratic freedom alone can be the foundation for a vital society and for a just government. Similarly, we find liberalism offending traditionalism, reaction annoying the progressive mind, and this kind of "ism" irritating and inflaming another "ism" which commands the admiration and loyalty of earnest and honest people. The problem of "giving offense," or of "being offended," which is the other side of the coin, arises from the fact that human beings, individually and in groups, are committed to differences not only of race, nationality, and culture, but also of views on such significant issues as social structure and organization, political theory and practice, methods of education, standards of artistic expression, and religious faith, and much of the confusion in which our world finds itself today is due to the reluctance of people to take such differences into account in the relationship between individuals and groups. We know, of course, that fundamental differences exist; we also know that they cause serious social irritation and tension, but having thought thus far, we are either afraid or reluctant to face the simple proposition that "giving offense" is inescapable and that we must learn, and that soon, to answer the question: "How can people of differing faiths, ideologies and theologies, mores and traditions continue to offend each other without seriously disrupting the international social pattern?" That the answer is not an easy one, goes without saying, but that an answer must be found would also seem a stern obligation for all thinking people.

Witness the political scene in America today; or the educational, the cultural, the scientific, or the religious scene. Is it not true that everywhere you have fine and upright people holding opinions that are not only unpopular and unpleasant to their fellow-citizens but that actually provoke bitter disagreement and often lead to violent and destructive partisanship? If you need a proof of how easy it is to give offense in matters of political loyalty and party devotion just listen to the speeches that already are issuing from partisan quarters, speeches that may clarify and explain issues and

problems, but that also stir up antagonism and arouse tempers and emotions. In the world of education we are facing an excellent example of how easy it is for those, for instance, of the traditional view regarding the three R's to be rudely disturbed and deeply offended by those who hold to the methods and ways of Progressive Education, and vice versa. In art, in literature, in music, the voices that give and take offense are lively and loud, and I doubt whether the time will ever come when a new technique in any of the arts will not arouse loud protest from quarters that are "offended" by what they consider a violation of "accepted" norms and standards in the pursuit of beauty.

We have been told that religion should be the great mediating and lubricating influence in society; it should teach men that they are all children of God and therefore should act like loving and considerate members of one "happy family." As a matter of fact, nowhere is there as much offense given and taken as in the world of religion where often the slightest deviation from "the faith" gives such grave offense that the offended one, individual or group, feels he can punish the offense only by disciplining, excommunicating, torturing, or even killing the offender; and certainly it is not exaggerating the matter to say that in our modern world in which the shibboleths of tolerance, good will and brotherhood are so often used, religious people are daily and freely offending one another, all in the name of "the true faith" and the "true church," not to mention the many other convenient clichés. Our religious leaders and teachers tell us that we must not, as a matter of moral conduct, give offense to our neighbors; we must not hurt their feelings nor injure their sensibilities, remembering that they are children of the same Father and deserving of our respect and affection. And in the next breath these religious "authorities" will preach doctrines and promulgate dogmas, define truths and interpret their scriptures in terms that must grossly offend, if not insult, people whose sense of religion and morality is completely alien to such doctrines and hostile to such dogmas. Should not these religious leaders let their people know that by holding certain beliefs and proclaiming certain truths they are unavoidably committed to giving offense, that such offense must be given unless personal spiritual integrity be compromised, but also that reasonable and intelligent men and women must be taught by their religion how to soften such offense and how to take the edge off those obvious differences that otherwise are certain to make for misunderstanding, prejudice, and animosity?

Jesus of Nazareth once said to his disciples, "it is impossible but that offenses will come; but woe unto him, through whom they come!" I agree with the first part of this quotation, but not with the latter part, for I honestly believe that while offense must be given by every honest person who differs from another honest person, such offense need not lead to social disturbance and individual hostility. It may also be recalled that this same Jesus was not sparing in his use of words that grievously hurt his Jewish fellowmen and gravely offended the religious teachers and leaders of his day. Or take the beginnings of the new religion that arose in the Middle East after the death of the Nazarene; is it not true that practically every major tenet of the church was bound to offend and grossly insult Judaism, the mother-faith? Can we imagine what it meant for the Jew to have his doctrine of Monotheism changed into Christian Trinitarianism; to have Jesus, the Carpenter's son, elevated to the Godhead, and to have a Jewish teacher of obscure origin declared the "Messiah" of Jewish expectation and hope? Shall we, then, say that Jesus and his disciples should have modified their statements of faith, that a St. Paul should have refrained from voicing his antinomianism, so offensive to the Jewish mind, or that the church should have softened its emphasis upon those doctrines that seemed particularly unpalatable to the Jew? No, we cannot say that, but we can and must say that recognizing the offense-giving tendency of Christian doctrine the church might well have softened the "offense" it was giving by treating the Jew with more respect and consideration and by frankly recognizing his immortal contribution to Christian doctrine, faith, and morals.

What is the solution for this difficult problem, viz., that, while honest and upright people cannot possibly be expected to compromise their faith and the principles of their religion because these are certain to offend others, some solution to the dilemma must be found in attitudes that will take bitterness and vindictiveness out of a relationship which throughout the centuries has been so fraught with danger to the individual and to society. May I suggest that any final solution cannot be expected; at best we may hope that the intelligence and good will of people will lead to an amelioration of the friction and tension caused by the diverging and opposing views of good people in the various departments of our social life. Some may be willing to say, dogmatically and finally, "we have the truth, we profess and practise this truth, therefore any offense given to those who hold to error and half-truth must be considered part of the discipline they must accept for their refusal to share the truth that we offer to them." This is much too glib and convenient a generalization and may well become fanatics and bigots, charlatans, and hypocrites. The intelligent and reasonable person will refuse so easy a subterfuge and argue something like this: since it seems inevitable that in a conflict of convictions and opinions offense must be given and taken, let those of us who are devoted to any particular theology or ideology at least agree to moderate the expression of our convictions to the point where any offense given or taken cannot be charged to a deliberate desire of serving the cause of vindictiveness, of malice, of needless asperity, of recrimination, and of vulgar intolerance. If offense must be given where honest convictions and deeply rooted attitudes of heart and mind are concerned, let us at least to this extent emphasize the spirit of charity, good will, neighborliness, and mutual appreciation native to all high religion, where it cannot be said of us that our fundamental differences have made us willing tools of demagogues, of fanatics, and of bigots in high places and low.

Let me repeat: to give offense may be unavoidable, but to flavor such offense with a spirit of bitterness and acrimony, with unreasonable hostility and vulgar prejudice can be avoided; and this is a truth which, I believe, is not sufficiently being emphasized in our land at a time when especially the relationship between Catholics and non-Catholics is being subjected to strains and tensions because of certain differences regarding issues that to both parties appear significant, if not fundamental. This is particularly true of the Catholic-Protestant relationship where grave differences of conviction prevail regarding such issues as federal aid to education, censorship, marriage and divorce. On all of these issues Catholics and Protestants hold widely diverging and uncompromisingly differing views, and

what one side says about these issues is almost certain to offend and irritate the other side. Shall we expect either side to offer a compromise that will mean a sacrifice of principle and conviction? We would be both unreasonable and foolish to harbor such vain hopes. What then can be done about this "exchange of offense" on the part of religious people, all of whom, under the guaranties of religious freedom granted by our constitution, have the two-fold right to hold their opinions and convictions and to propagandize and publicize and defend them with every legitimate means and method. Again, the answer should not be too difficult for people who take their religion seriously and at the same time recognize that true religion does not operate with the weapons of hate, violence, and malice. I would formulate my answer something like this, being conscious as I write that even this humble suggestion of mine will annoy many and give painful offense to many others.

The very existence of Protestantism is an affront to Rome, even as the continued existence and missionary labor of Rome continue to be an affront to Protestants. Everybody knows that a situation like this one duplicated in a Catholic country would easily be solved, and the solution would quite likely be some form of suppression of the Protestant minority. In a Protestant land of the temper and tradition of America, any solution for the Catholic-Protestant controversy will have to take another form, and this is the form: Catholics and Protestants will have to remember that as citizens of this land they enjoy equal rights, and that on the basis of these rights they must learn to adjust their relationship to the point where, all fundamental differences of doctrine, rite, and mores notwithstanding, the Catholic must show respect for the Protestant and vice versa; and this must be done in full recognition of the incontrovertible fact that in matters of "faith and morals" neither Rome nor its Protestant opponents can afford to compromise; therefore offense must be given—cannot be avoided—and the situation that remains is always fraught with danger and social dynamite. If, however, both Catholic and Protestant, as well as other non-Catholics, could agree to meet the inescapable situation with a measure of grace, with a modicum of understanding and mutual appreciation, with a bit of genuine charity and good will, not to mention a "pinch" of that sense of humor which can do so much to relieve tension and to dissolve irritation and annoyance, then, I am convinced, a *modus vivendi* and *modus operandi* can surely be found. And in that case religion will be the gainer and American democracy will have won new strength and received a new baptism of the spirit of freedom.

If offense must be given, and it will be as long as good people find themselves in conflict upon fundamental issues of religion, morality, government, social organization, education, art, etc., let us, members of the great historic faiths and of the great churches of our day, at least try to cultivate that temper of mind and that attitude of spirit which refuse to resort to malice, to contempt, to cheap retaliation, to vulgarity, and to those other methods of controversy and dispute that neither serve a good cause nor advance the life of a civilized and cultured society. We *can* and *must* learn to live together, all our differences notwithstanding, and it is our solemn obligation as religious people to do this with grace of spirit and with graciousness of heart.

Correspondence

Reply to Malick

To Unity:

In Unity for Nov.-Dec. 1955, John Malick writes an article entitled "The Religionists Make One World Difficult." He cites three trends to prove his point. With the first one, "opposition to the public schools" and the third one, the increase in teaching that we have come to the "last days" and so nothing but salvation is important, I find no fault.

But with the second one, the opposition to the U.N., I do. I think there is much less danger from those who oppose the U.N. than from those who think the U.N. can do the job of giving the world peace.

It is easy to fall into the error that because we call the organization the "United Nations" it is a union like the United States. The fact is, I think, that it is much less of a government than the United States was under the Articles of Confederation adopted in 1781.

Mr. Malick, it would seem, has fallen into the error of thinking that the U.N. is a government, for he writes, "It [the U.N.] differs from the church group in that it asks consent of all who come within its rule."

Now the fact is, of course, that the U.N. does not make law. It is a place where treaties are discussed. But every treaty has to go to the various governments for final action. More than that, each nation retains its sovereignty and makes its own interpretation of each treaty. The so-called U.N. Court has no compulsory jurisdiction over disputes between nations or between citizens of different nations.

So, whether we realize it or not, we still live in a state of international anarchy. And anarchy always has resulted in war sooner or later because it provides no way to settle disputes except by trial in battle.

Every well-governed country is a pilot plant showing the way to peace. We have peace in every well-governed country because the government monopolizes force and makes people talk out their differences. If we would have peace in the world we can have it but it will not come through the present U.N. because it lacks both the monopoly of force on the international field and a common language in which to talk over disputes.

Instead, then, of Unitarians and liberals looking for the trouble in those who are opposed to the U.N., we should be working to make the U.N. the kind of an organization it should be.

The job is to make every man in the world who carries arms give his support to the U.N., just as every man in uniform in the United States takes an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. This can be done by making the U.N. over into a federal union like the United States of America.

The other job, and the one which in my judgment must come first, is that we must show our loyalty to the decision of UNESCO for the auxiliary language Esperanto. On December 10, 1954, the world's highest educational authority voted 30 to 5 in favor of giving the "green light" to Esperanto. Seventeen, mostly communist, countries abstained. But since the death of Stalin the Communists have changed their line and are now no longer suppressing Esperanto but are in fact encouraging its use and spread. In fact the Sunday *Times* of London, on January 22, 1956, reported that Molotov had replied to a telegram from Japan in Esperanto.

If UNESCO had suggested Chinese I could forgive my friends for not even trying to learn the language. But any reader of this article can master the Esperanto grammar in an hour. The rest is vocabulary and he would already know from 70 to 80 of all the root words. Is it, then, asking too much to ask any one to be loyal to this decision? Not if you want peace and prosperity. Not if you reject the idea that we are in the "last days." Not if you have ever prayed: "Thy kingdom come on earth." Not if you would stop totalitarianism from taking over.

If you would like to be brought up to date on Esperanto, please write me.

Route #1
Madison, Wisconsin

Glenn P. Turner.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

UNIVERSALIST-UNITARIAN MERGER!??!

Discussions are being held at various ministers', area, and regional meetings on the question of Unitarian-Universalist relationships. A "Rumor Clinic" was recently conducted which brought out some of the things being said about Universalists by Unitarians and vice versa. Here are some of the chords and discords which have reached this writer's ears.

A. What some Universalists are saying about Unitarians:

1. The officers of the Unitarian Ministers Association are opposed to merger.
2. Unitarians tend to be authoritarian in their organizational structure.
3. Unitarian officials, both national and regional, do not really want merger.
4. Unitarian churches are really not free to choose their minister, since denominational officials name the candidates.

B. What some Unitarians are saying about Universalists:

1. Universalists are demanding equal control of all cooperative endeavors, even though they are numerically much smaller and financially much weaker.
2. Control of the Universalist State Conventions over church affairs and ordination is incompatible with Unitarian congregational polity and ordination by local church.
3. Universalists have a "chip on their shoulder" and are supersensitive concerning invitations to cooperation made by Unitarians.
4. Universalist standards of leadership, both lay and clerical, are lower than Unitarian standards and that merger would retard Unitarian Advance.

C. Some common questions:

1. If merger comes, will Universalist State Conventions or Unitarian Regions be predominant in the organizational structure?
2. Will standards for ministerial candidates be established and maintained so that they cannot be by-passed?
3. Should new churches or fellowships be organized unless jointly sponsored?
4. Do Unitarians and Universalists really have a common approach to religion in both theory and practice?

These attitudes and questions are important since the Unitarians will be voting at the May Meetings on the Report of the Joint Commission on which they could not act last August due to the lack of a quorum. The Commission did not rule out other means of cooperation but did make it clear that it was decidedly for merger. Another proposal to be considered by the Annual Meeting of the American Unitarian Association is that of a recommendation to employ a management and organizational analyst to ascertain facts, upon which an intelligent decision can be made as to the methods or feasibility of merger.

L.R.Y.—HIGH SCHOOL CONFERENCE

The Summer Conference for High School Students (9th through the 12th grades) will be held at College Camp, Williams Bay, Wisconsin, August 12 to 18, 1956. It will not meet with the Adult Family Summer Assembly as in the past. The Conference, sponsored by the Western Unitarian Conference, has been planned by a committee appointed by the Conference and consisting of both adults and representatives from several of the LRY Federations. Among the leaders and faculty are: Mr. and Mrs. Harold Moon, Dayton, Ohio, Directors; Rev. Peter Raible, Lincoln, Nebraska, Theme Speaker; Rev. Ellsworth Smith, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. William Gold, Boston, Director of the L.R.Y.; Miss Margaret Fisher, Cincinnati, Ohio. Registrations should be sent to Larry Brigham, 625 N. 6th St., Burlington, Iowa. Registration fee: $5.00.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION INSTITUTE

The Institute for Religious Education Directors and Church School Superintendents has completed the arrangements for its faculty and staff. They are: Dr. Angus MacLean, "Philosophy and Goals of Religious Education, the Building of Curriculum; Mrs. Grace Mayer-Oakes, "Church School Administration, Recruiting, Materials and Methods"; Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., "Inter-personal and Intergroup Relations—Working with Adults" . . . Mrs. Gladys R. Hilton will serve as Coordinator of the Institute.

THE GENEVA SUMMER ASSEMBLY

Flyers and registration cards are now out for the Geneva Summer Assembly to be held at College Camp, June 24 to 30, 1956. If you did not get one, ask your local Geneva chairman for one or write to the Conference Office. The complete program will be out soon. A stellar faculty has been secured. Among the faculty are Dr. Ralph Fuchs, Executive Director of the American Association of University Professors; Dr. Henry Nelson Weiman, famed religious philosopher and teacher; Dr. Dale DeWitt, Regional Director for the Middle Atlantic States Council; and Miss Frances Wood, Field Representative of the Division of Education of the Council of Liberal Churches. Watch for the programs for the listing of the other stars of the Geneva Galaxy.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION CHAIRMAN TO LEAVE

Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, Jeanne to her many friends, has been a creative and dynamic force in the religious education program of the Conference. Her leadership has made the Conference Religious Education Committee an increasingly effective part of the regional organization. The Committee's contribution to the Geneva Summer Assembly has been outstanding. It was Mrs. Kuch who first suggested the Director's Institute which has met with such enthusiastic response. The Kuchs will be moving this summer to Pittsburgh, where "Dick" will be Regional General Manager for the Wells Organizations.

A FRIEND IN NEED!

The Religious Education Committee has canvassed the Conference to secure volunteer "experts" who would be willing to assist other churches in various fields of religious education. These friends will be willing to visit you for expenses only if you have need of them.

1. Discussion and Interpretation of R. E. Goals and Philosophy:

Mrs. Harry W. Adams, 4500 Warwick Blvd., Kansas City, Mo.
Mrs. J. B. Cleary, 5742 Kenwood Ave., Chicago 37, Ill.
Mrs. John M. Ely, Jr., 203 23rd St., N.E., Cedar Rapids, Ia.
Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
Mrs. Eleanor Lewis, 1174 E. 57th St., Chicago 37, Ill.
Rev. Russell L. Lincoln, 5545 Cambourne Pl., Birmingham, Mich.
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer, 1453 N. Alabama, Indianapolis 2, Ind.
Mrs. Vincent Silliman, 10207 S. Union, Chicago 28, Ill.
Miss Elizabeth M. Whitman, 739 Portland Ave., St. Paul 4, Minn.
Miss Constance Young, 4605 Cass Ave., Detroit 1, Mich.

2. Church School Administration:

Mrs. Harry W. Adams
Mrs. J. B. Cleary
Mrs. Randall Hilton
Mrs. Eleanor Lewis
Rev. Russell L. Lincoln
Mr. James H. Percival, 1329 Bursal, Cincinnati 30, Ohio
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer
Miss Elizabeth M. Whitman
Miss Constance Young

3. Curriculum Planning:

Mrs. J. B. Cleary
Mrs. Eleanor Lewis
Rev. Russell L. Lincoln
Mr. James H. Percival
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer
Mrs. Vincent Silliman
Miss Elizabeth M. Whitman
Miss Constance Young

4. Curriculum Methods:

Mrs. J. B. Cleary
Mrs. Eleanor Lewis
Rev. Russell Lincoln
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer
Mrs. Vincent Silliman
Miss Elizabeth M. Whitman
Miss Constance Young

5. Teaching Methods:

Mrs. J. B. Cleary
Mrs. John M. Ely, Jr.
Mrs. Eleanor Lewis
Rev. Russell L. Lincoln
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer
Mrs. Vincent Silliman
Mrs. Edwin White, 6434 Agnes, Kansas City 30, Mo.

6. Parent Work:

Mrs. Randall Hilton

7. Teacher Training:

Mrs. Harry W. Adams
Mrs. J. B. Cleary
Mrs. John M. Ely, Jr.
Mrs. Eleanor Lewis
Rev. Russell L. Lincoln
Mr. James H. Percival
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer
Mrs. Edwin White
Mrs. Elizabeth M. Whitman

8. The Small Church School:

Mrs. J. B. Cleary
Mrs. John M. Ely, Jr.
Mrs. Vincent Silliman

9. Worship and Worship Materials:

Mrs. Eleanor Lewis
Rev. Russell Lincoln
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer
Rev. Vincent Silliman, 10207 S. Union, Chicago 28, Ill.
Miss Elizabeth M. Whitman
Miss Constance Young

10. Music:

Rev. Vincent Silliman

11. Visual Aids:

Mrs. Eleanor Lewis

12. Arts and Crafts:

Mrs. John M. Ely, Jr.
Mr. James H. Percival
Mrs. Fritz Schaefer

"Time is more than where hands point on a clock
Or a pendulum's even swing
Or sand through glass
Or a clear bell.
Time is the way something that is alive looks at things
And feels things
And fears
And hopes
And dreams
And cries
And laughs
And marks it all down
And divides it up
And makes one thing follow another
And because of this
Can put all possible meaning into a question:
'What Time Is It?' "

—From "Tomorrow Always Is."
By John Hanly Morgan.